

*In the Queen's Bench.*

---

APPEAL SIDE.

ALBERT G. WOODWARD,

*Appellant.*

VS.

HANNAH BELKNAP, ES QUALITE,

*Respondent.*

---

---

RESPONDENT'S CASE.

---



PROV  
LOWE

PROVINCE OF CANADA,  
LOWER CANADA TO WIT.

In the Queen's Bench,

APPEAL SIDE.

ALBERT G. WOODWARD,  
*Plaintiff in the Court below,*  
APPELLANT.

vs.  
HANNAH BELKNAP, *es qualite,*  
*Defendant in the Court below,*  
RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENT'S CASE.

WOODWARD, Plaintiff in the Court below, sued Defendant, on an account of £93 4 0 for goods sold, or-  
ders paid, &c., all of which was alleged to have accrued against Defendant's husband, before his decease,  
except £1 5 4 charges for goods had immediately after his decease. The Defendant was sued solely in her  
quality of tutrix to the minor children of her late husband, Joseph Bailey. There is no direct proof of her  
quality, nor is it specially denied. The Defendant's special plea, was to the effect that Plaintiff was indebted  
to the estate of the late Joseph Bailey in the sum of £18 8 0 price of pails sold him, and in £28 15 0  
for waggon, horse, and other articles sold him, and in two certain sums of money, namely, £79 16 4 and  
£6 5 0; the former received 24th May, 1853, and the latter 13th August, 1853, by Plaintiff of Nelson &  
Butters of Montreal, to and for the use of the late Joseph Bailey. The first two items mentioned above are  
acknowledged by the Plaintiff and credited in his account, and of the cash the receipt of £20 is also ad-  
mitted in Plaintiff's account sued upon. The main issue between the parties was upon the remaining £66 1  
4 which Plaintiff pretends to have accounted for to the late Joseph Bailey. The proof of this fact devolved  
upon him. How has he attempted to establish it? Not by producing any voucher or receipt of any  
kind, but by evidence of the vaguest and most inconclusive character. He says he received the moneys as a  
friendly act, and has attempted to prove that persons very frequently take moneys in this manner without ex-  
ecuting a receipt upon delivery of the money. The most that could be inferred from such proof under any  
circumstances, is that persons are frequently careless and do business in a very insecure manner. But un-  
fortunately for him, his own acts preclude any such inference as that the money was taken simply as a friend-  
ly act. He carried an order from Bailey to Nelson and Butters, and gave them a receipt which was a dis-  
charge from Bailey to them. Is it a reasonable inference that having given such a receipt, as a business  
man, he would not, had he paid over the money to Bailey, have taken a receipt from him? But there is a  
still stronger presumption against Plaintiff from his own acts. According to his own statement he kept £20  
of that money. If it were brought simply as the act of a friend, why was any of it retained? By what  
right? There is another significant fact. In an account rendered long prior to the institution of this action  
by Plaintiff, produced by Defendant in her Exhibit No. 2, there is no sum of money credited to Bailey, but  
there is an entry on the credit side, in the following words:

"Cr. by contra acc.  
1853, May 26."

This shews that Plaintiff was intending to credit Bailey's account, which had not then been furnished, and  
afterwards there was something else to credit on 26th May, 1853, two days after he received the sum of  
£79 16 4 of Nelson & Butters in Montreal, being just about the time he would return to Sherbrooke. All  
these facts preclude the inference that this money was taken by him as a friendly carrier and delivered to  
Bailey. It strongly favors the supposition that he retained the money, to be accounted for on settlement.  
This view of the case is rendered more probable from the fact that Bailey was at the time carrying on a  
Pail Factory, and Woodward as a trader and dealer in provisions, was furnishing supplies for his men, and  
Bailey died in 1851, before any settlement could take place.

The Plaintiff has placed much emphasis upon the fact that the charge for these moneys does not appear in Bailey's books, until en-  
tered by his representatives. This proves too much for Plaintiff's purpose, if the sums £79 16 4 and £6  
5 0 should appear as charged in Bailey's books if had by Woodward, then *a fortiori* the £20 had by him,  
which is credited, should appear in Bailey's books, because this £20 according to Woodward's pretensions,  
must have been had by him of Bailey, by his express consent, and as a matter of course, would have been  
charged. So much for the probabilities of the case. Respondent takes, however, bolder ground. She  
maintains that the proof by Nelson & Butters, that Woodward received these sums of money, and gave a  
formal receipt therefor, devolves upon him the necessity of proving, in a direct manner, that he accounted  
for the same to Bailey.

If any other ground than this were admissible there would be no safety in business transactions. If one  
person receives money for the use of another, proof of the receipt of this money must devolve upon the  
recipient the necessity to account. And how account? By shewing after a man is dead how great or how  
moderate was the friendship existing between the parties, in order to measure the probabilities of their aban-  
doning the ordinary precautions which men usually take in their dealings with one another? Appellant de-  
mands reversal of the final judgment because the Honorable Judge in the Court below refused the applica-  
tion to examine witness Burns a second time. This refusal was most proper. There were no facts stated  
that could be proved by Burns, and even if there were, if these were facts within the knowledge of wit-  
ness, when first examined he was bound to state the whole truth, and Plaintiff was required to know what he  
could state; and further, there is affidavit of defendant showing good grounds to suppose that injustice would  
be done her if Burns were examined a second time.

The Plaintiff attempts to prove that late Joseph Bailey's circumstances were such that he could not have  
spared the money charged to Woodward. This is not proved. It was shown that at times he was in need

of money for his business, but this could be proved of most business men. His credit was always good, and he left a good estate, while it may well be inferred that Woodward's need of the money was much more pressing than Bailey's, inasmuch as he has twice been *en état de faillite*. The following was the judgment appealed against, rendered by the Honorable Edward Short, J. S. C., at Sherbrooke, 30th June, 1858 :

"The Court having heard the parties by their respective Counsel, and examined the pleadings, evidence and proceedings of record in this cause, and on the whole deliberated, considering that the Plaintiff hath established that the said Defendant, in her said quality was indebted to him in twenty-six pounds one shilling, the balance of Plaintiff's account for goods, wares and merchandize sold and delivered by the Plaintiff to the said late Joseph Bailey, and to the said Defendant, and that the same was and is compensated by the sum of eighty-six pounds one shilling and four pence received by the said Plaintiff, of Nelson & Butters of and for the use of the said Joseph Bailey, as pleaded by the said Defendant, doth adjudge and declare the sum of twenty-six pounds one shilling to have been before the institution of this action fully paid, and compensated, and doth dismiss the Plaintiff's action, with costs, distraction of which is awarded to Messrs. Sanborn & Brooks, the Defendant's Attorneys."

SANBORN & BROOKS,  
*Attorneys for Respondent.*

was always good,  
y was much more  
was the judgment  
June, 1858 :

findings, evidence  
the Plaintiff hath  
y-six pounds one  
delivered by the  
was and is com-  
Plaintiff, of Nel-  
ant, doth adjudge  
of this action ful-  
which is awarded

& BROOKS,  
for Respondent.